

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-10, 12, and 13 have been amended herein and claims 15-19 are added herein. In view of these amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims.

Claim 4 was objected to for depending from itself. The dependency of claim 4 has been corrected to depend from claim 3.

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,798,679 by Matsumoto, *et al.* Applicant respectfully disagrees. More specifically, the original independent claim defined an electronic device comprised of active circuit elements and/or redundant circuit elements formed in one surface or first side of the substrate and programmable fuse elements or bonding pads formed on the other surface or second side of the substrate. The active circuit elements and/or redundant circuit elements on one side of the substrate are connected to the programmable fuse elements (or bonding pad) on the other side or surface. According to one dependent claim, the connection from one side to the other was by an opening formed through the substrate.

The Matsumoto, *et al.* reference simply does not teach these elements. For example, Masumoto, *et al.* discloses a base substrate (2) having a multiplicity of first chips (1) mounted on one side of substrate (2) during initial fabrication, and one or more replacement or repair chips (3) mounted on the other side of substrate (2) *only* after one of the first chips is proven to be defective. Thus, it is clear that Matsumoto, *et al.* does not even suggest, much less teach, active and redundant circuit elements “formed” in the same substrates on one side and programmable fuse elements (or bonding pads) “formed” in the same substrate on the opposite side of the substrate than the circuits.

More specifically, if substrate 2 is shown in FIG. 3 of Matsumoto, *et al.* is considered to be the substrate required by the claims, neither the active or redundant circuit elements nor the programmable fuse elements are formed "on" either of its surface or sides. On the other hand, if the active circuit chip 1 as shown in FIG. 3 of Matsumoto is considered the substrate required by the claims, there is no suggestion of redundant circuit or programmable fuse elements being formed on that chip. Similarly, if the redundant chip 3 is considered as the required substrate, there is no suggestion of active circuits or programmable fuse elements being formed on that chip.

In any event, to further clarify this distinction, the independent claims now specifically require that the circuit elements be formed on one surface of a single semiconductor chip and the programmable fuse elements be formed on the opposite side of the same chip.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the original independent claims 1 and 12 as well as new independent claim 15 now clearly defines over all references of record and are allowable. Likewise, the dependent claims 2-11, 13, 14 and 16-19 are also allowable for depending from a claim deemed allowable as well as for their own limitations.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner pass the case to issuance. If the Examiner should have any questions, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's attorney at 972-732-1001 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. However, should one be deemed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the appropriate fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

16 March 2005
Date

James C. Kesterson
James C. Kesterson
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 25,882

Slater & Matsil, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252-5793
Tel. 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218